



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,198	04/21/2004	HuaLong Chen		9358
25859	7590	01/25/2007		EXAMINER
WEI TE CHUNG FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC. 1650 MEMOREX DRIVE SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			SHEDRICK, CHARLES TERRELL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/830,198	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles Shedrick	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehm US Patent Pub. No.: 2004/0085944 A1 in view of well-known prior art.

Consider claim 1, Boehm teaches a wireless gateway subject to the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) 802.11b protocol (i.e., 315 figure 3), the wireless gateway comprising: a central processing unit (CPU) for restructuring and transmitting Internet protocol (IP) packets (i.e., the CPU is inherently processing the packets); an Ethernet transceiver connected with the CPU for transmitting and receiving Ethernet frames (i.e., see the functionality of hub/switch 320); and at least one port connected with the CPU for connecting one or more computers and/or computer peripherals in a wireless manner (i.e., interchangeable interface 350).

However, Boehm does not specifically teach at least one synchronous dynamic random access memory (SDRAM) connected with the CPU for exchanging data with the CPU, and for storing application programs; a flash memory connected with the CPU for storing driving programs and related configurations; a crystal oscillator connected with the CPU for providing clock signals for the CPU.

Nonetheless, the examiner takes official notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to include at least one synchronous dynamic random access memory (SDRAM) connected with the CPU for exchanging data with the CPU, and for storing application programs; a flash memory connected with the CPU for storing driving programs and related configurations; a crystal oscillator connected with the CPU for providing clock signals for the CPU.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include at least one synchronous dynamic random access memory (SDRAM) connected with the CPU for exchanging data with the CPU, and for storing application programs; a flash memory connected with the CPU for storing driving programs and

Art Unit: 2617

related configurations; a crystal oscillator connected with the CPU for providing clock signals for the CPU for the purpose of operating an electronic device.

Consider claim 6 and as applied the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 1, Boehm as modified by well known prior art teaches wherein the Ethernet transceiver comprises one or more Ethernet ports for communicating with local area networks (LANs) and wide area networks (WANs) each in one-to-one correspondence (paragraph 0019).

Consider claim 7 and as applied the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 1, Boehm as modified by well known prior art teaches wherein said port is a universal serial bus (USB) port (i.e., see paragraph 0025 and claim 15)

Consider claim 8 and as applied the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 7, Boehm as modified by well known prior art teaches wherein the USB port is connected with the computers and/or the computer peripherals by using a wireless network card that comprises a USB interface (i.e., see paragraph 0025 and claim 15).

Consider claim 9 and as applied the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 1, Boehm as modified by well known prior art teaches wherein said port is a personal computer memory card international association (PCMCIA) port (see paragraph 0023).

Consider claim 10 and as applied the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 9, Boehm as modified by well known prior art teaches wherein the PCMCIA port is connected with the computers and/or the computer peripherals by using a wireless network card that comprises a PCMCIA interface(see paragraph 0023).

Art Unit: 2617

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehm US Patent Pub.

No.: 2004/0085944 A1 in view of well-known prior art and further in view of Ito US Patent No.: 5,457,660

Consider **claim 2 and as applied to the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 1**, Boehm as modified by well-known prior –art teaches the claimed invention except further comprising a reset circuit for resetting a clock of the CPU.

However, in analogous art, Ito teaches a reset circuit for resetting a clock of the CPU (i.e., see abstract and claim 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boehm as modified by well-known prior art to include a reset circuit for resetting the clock of a CPU as taught by Ito.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehm US Patent Pub. No.: 2004/0085944 A1 in view of well-known prior art and further in view of Feldstein et al. US Patent Pub. No.: 20030225955A1.

Consider **claim 3 and as applied to the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 1**, Boehm as modified by well-known prior –art teaches the claimed invention except further comprising a joint test action group (JTAG) port for testing the CPU.

However, in analogous art, Feldstein et al. teach the claimed invention further comprising a joint test action group (JTAG) port for testing the CPU (i.e., see paragraph 0011).

Art Unit: 2617

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boehm as modified by well-known prior art to include the claimed invention further comprising a joint test action group (JTAG) port for testing the CPU as taught by Feldstein.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehm US Patent Pub.

No.: 2004/0085944 A1 in view of well-known prior art and further in view Chen et al. US Patent Pub. No.: 20010030950 A1.

Consider **claim 4 and as applied to the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 1**, Boehm as modified by well-known prior –art teaches the claimed invention except further comprising a an RS232 transceiver connected with the CPU.

However, in analogous art, Chen et al. teach the claimed invention further comprising an RS232 transceiver connected with the CPU (see figure 6b).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boehm as modified by well-known prior art to include the claimed invention further comprising an RS232 transceiver connected with the CPU as taught by Chen et al. for the purpose of interfacing the CPU.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boehm US Patent Pub.

No.: 2004/0085944 A1 in view of well-known prior art and further in view Connery et al. US Patent No.: 6,570,884 B1.

Art Unit: 2617

Consider **claim 5 and as applied to the wireless gateway as claimed in claim 1**, Boehm as modified by well-known prior –art teaches the claimed invention except wherein the crystal oscillator provides clock signals of 20Mhz for the CPU.

However, in analogous art, Connery et al. teach the claimed invention wherein the crystal oscillator provides clock signals of 20Mhz for the CPU (i.e., see col. 5 lines 30-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Boehm as modified by well-known prior art to include wherein the crystal oscillator provides clock signals of 20Mhz for the CPU as taught by Connery et al. for the purpose of being cost efficient.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Shedrick whose telephone number is (571)-272-8621. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kincaid Lester can be reached on (571)-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Charles Shedrick
AU 2617
January 20, 2007



LESTER G. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER